

Claims 20 and 22 have been amended, and claims 28-59 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments or new claims. For instance, support for new claims 28, 29 38, 39, 51 and 52 appears e.g. at page 20, lines 1-2 of the application. Support for the amendment of claims 20 and new claims 30, 33, 36, 37, 45, 46, 50, 58, and 59 appears e.g. in the original claims and page 13, lines 24-25 and page 19, lines 12-14 of the application. Support for new claims 31, 32, 41, 42, 54 and 55 appears e.g. on page 10, lines 18-19 of the application. Support for the amendment of claim 22 and new claims 34, 35, 43, 44, 47, 48, 56 and 57 appears e.g. on page 11, lines 18-19 and pages 16-17 of the application.

Claims 20, 22, 23, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Mertens et al. (U.S. Patent 3,820,995).

While Applicants fully disagree with the rejection, it is also believed the rejection has been obviated by the amendments made herein. For instance, claim 20 calls for a substrate that is an integrated circuit substrate or a flat panel display substrate. The photographic composition reported by Mertens does not suggest such substrates. Claim 22 calls for a photoresist that comprises a photoacid generator compound. Again, the photographic report by Mertens et al. does not disclose such photoresists.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

It is believed the application in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Mori et al.
U.S.S.N. 08/726,613
Page 7

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)
DIKE, BRONSTEIN, ROBERTS
& CUSHMAN, LLP
130 Water Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 523-3400